

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

EDWARD JAMES DRYG,
Petitioner, No. C 06-7729 PJH

v.
10
11 SHEILA E. MITCHELL, Chief, Santa
12 Clara County Probation Department,
Respondent.

**ORDER DENYING PETITION FOR
WRIT OF HABEAS CORPUS**

14 Before the court is the petition for writ of habeas corpus pursuant to 28 U.S.C. §
15 2254, filed by state prisoner, Edward James Dryg (“Dryg”), who is presently on probation
16 following a judgment of conviction in the Superior Court of California, County of Santa
17 Clara. Having reviewed the parties’ papers, the record, and having carefully considered
18 their arguments and the relevant legal authorities, the court hereby DENIES the petition.

BACKGROUND

20 || A. Procedural Background

21 On May 3, 2001, Dryg was first charged in Santa Clara Superior Court with felony
22 violations of California Penal Code § 261.5(c) (unlawful sexual intercourse with minor more
23 than three years younger than perpetrator), § 288a(b)(1) (oral copulation with minor), and §
24 289(h) (forcible sexual penetration by foreign or unknown object of person under age of
25 eighteen), all alleged to have occurred on August 13, 1998. On September 3, 2003, the
26 trial court dismissed the charges without prejudice, and the state re-filed the charges on
27 October 14, 2003, and subsequently amended the information on February 18, 2004.

28 Dryg entered a no contest plea to all three charges on July 20, 2004. On September

1 30, 2004, the trial court sentenced Dryg to probation and imposed a one-year county jail
2 term. Dryg filed a notice of appeal that same day.

3 On November 29, 2004, the trial court denied Dryg's application for a certificate of
4 probable cause, and the California Court of Appeal dismissed the appeal for failure to
5 obtain such a certificate on December 15, 2005. On March 23, 2006, Dryg filed a petition
6 for writ of habeas corpus with the state trial court, which it denied on May 22, 2006, and
7 subsequently denied on reconsideration on July 5, 2006. Dryg then filed a petition for
8 habeas relief with California Supreme Court on August 28, 2006, which the court summarily
9 denied on September 27, 2006.

10 On December 18, 2006, Dryg filed the instant petition for federal habeas relief.

11 **B. Factual Background**

12 The charges stem from the following alleged conduct. During the summer of 1998,
13 Dryg, who was forty-five years-old at the time, met the sixteen year-old female victim via an
14 internet chat room. Dryg lived in Los Gatos, California; the victim was from Houston,
15 Texas, and was living in a dormitory at the University of California-Berkeley campus
16 attending a chemistry program that summer. After meeting online, Dryg invited the victim
17 to a coffee shop near campus, and they met and had lunch. A few days later, Dryg
18 contacted the victim and offered to pay her to have sex with him. The victim agreed, and
19 on August 13, 2008, Dryg picked up the victim and took her to Palo Alto, where they had
20 dinner. After dinner, Dryg took the victim to his home, where he orally copulated her, she
21 orally copulated him, he had sexual intercourse with her, and he penetrated the victim
22 anally with a dildo. Dryg subsequently paid the victim \$250.00. There was no further
23 sexual activity between Dryg and the victim following that night.

24 A year later, in October 1999, the victim was hospitalized for suicidal tendencies,
25 and, in the course of treatment, revealed the incident with Dryg. She then reported the
26 incident to the Palo Alto Police Department, but because the victim was unaware of Dryg's
27 last name, authorities were unable to locate him.

28 Meanwhile, also in October 1999, Dryg was arrested in the Northern District of

1 Illinois and charged with traveling in interstate commerce for the purpose of engaging in
2 sexual acts with a person under 18 years of age, after he unknowingly corresponded on the
3 internet with an FBI agent posing as a young girl and then traveled to Chicago, Illinois. On
4 September 12, 2000, Dryg pleaded guilty to the charge, and was sentenced to forty-one
5 months in prison and to three years supervised release. In the course of those federal
6 proceedings, Dryg admitted to the incident with the victim in this case, and the Los Gatos
7 Police Department investigated, resulting in the charges against Dryg underlying this
8 federal habeas case.

9 ISSUE

10 Dryg raised a single claim in his habeas petition before this court: that his trial
11 counsel rendered ineffective assistance by not properly raising and preserving his
12 challenge to the Interstate Agreement on Detainers.

13 STANDARD OF REVIEW

14 This court may entertain a petition for writ of habeas corpus “on behalf of a person
15 in custody pursuant to the judgment of a state court only on the ground that he is in custody
16 in violation of the Constitution or laws or treaties of the United States.” 28 U.S.C. §
17 2254(a). Because the petition in this case was filed after the effective date of the
18 Antiterrorism and Effective Death Penalty Act of 1996 (AEDPA), the provisions of that act
19 apply here. See *Lindh v. Murphy*, 521 U.S. 320, 327 (1997). Under the AEDPA, a district
20 court may not grant a petition challenging a state conviction or sentence on the basis of a
21 claim that was reviewed on the merits in state court unless the state court’s adjudication of
22 the claim: “(1) resulted in a decision that was contrary to, or involved an unreasonable
23 application of, clearly established Federal law, as determined by the Supreme Court of the
24 United States; or (2) resulted in a decision that was based on an unreasonable
25 determination of the facts in light of the evidence presented in the State court proceeding.”
26 28 U.S.C. § 2254 (d).

27 A state court decision is “contrary to” Supreme Court authority, falling within the first
28 clause of § 2254(d)(1), only if “the state court arrives at a conclusion opposite to that

1 reached by [the Supreme] Court on a question of law or if the state court decided a case
2 differently than [the Supreme] Court has on a set of materially indistinguishable facts.”
3 *Williams v. Taylor*, 529 U.S. 362, 412-413 (2000). “Clearly established federal law” under §
4 2254(d)(1) is the governing legal principle or principles set forth by the Supreme Court at
5 the time the state court renders its decision.” *Lockyer v. Andrade*, 538 U.S. 63, 71-72
6 (2003). This “clearly established” law “refers to the holdings, as opposed to the dicta, of
7 [Supreme] Court decisions as of the time of the relevant state court decision.” *Id.*

8 “Under the ‘unreasonable application’ clause” of § 2254(d)(1), a federal habeas court
9 may grant the writ if the state court identifies the correct governing legal principle from [the
10 Supreme] Court’s decisions but unreasonably applies that principle to the facts of the
11 prisoner’s case.” *Id.* at 74. However, this standard “requires the state court decision to be
12 more than incorrect or erroneous.” *Id.* For the federal court to grant habeas relief, the
13 state court’s application of the Supreme Court authority must be “objectively unreasonable.”
14 *Id.* at 74-75. The “objectively unreasonable” standard is different from the “clear error”
15 standard in that “the gloss of clear error fails to give proper deference to state courts by
16 conflating error (even clear error) with unreasonableness.” *Id.* at 75; see also *Clark v.*
17 *Murphy*, 331 F.3d 1062, 1068 (9th Cir. 2003). Therefore, “[i]t is not enough that a habeas
18 court, in its independent review of the legal question, is left with a firm conviction that the
19 state court was erroneous . . . Rather, the habeas court must conclude that the state
20 court’s application of federal law was objectively unreasonable.” *Andrade*, 538 U.S. at 75;
21 see also *Clark*, 331 F.3d at 1068.

22 As for state court findings of fact, under § 2254(d)(2), a federal court may not grant a
23 habeas petition by a state prisoner unless the adjudication of a claim on the merits by a
24 state court resulted in a decision that was based on an unreasonable determination of the
25 facts in light of the evidence presented in the state court proceeding. 28 U.S.C. §
26 2254(d)(2). The “clearly erroneous” standard of unreasonableness that applies in
27 determining the “unreasonable application” of federal law under § 2254(d)(1) also applies in
28 determining the “unreasonable determination of facts in light of the evidence” under §

1 2254(d)(2). See *Torres v . Prunty*, 223 F.3d 1103, 1107-1108 (9th Cir. 2000). To grant
2 relief under 2254(d)(2), a federal court must be “left with a firm conviction that the
3 determination made by the state court was wrong and that the one [petitioner] urges was
4 correct.” *Id.* at 1108.

5 However, when the state court decision does not articulate the rationale for its
6 determination or does not analyze the claim under *federal* constitutional law, a review of
7 that court’s application of clearly established federal law is not possible. See *Delgado v.*
8 *Lewis*, 223 F.3d 976, 981-82 (9th Cir. 2000); see also 2 J. Liebman & R. Hertz, *Federal*
9 *Habeas Corpus Practice and Procedure* § 32.2, at 1424-1426 & nn. 7-10 (4th ed. 2001).
10 When confronted with such a decision, a federal court must conduct an independent review
11 of the record and the relevant federal law to determine whether the state court’s decision
12 was “contrary to, or involved an unreasonable application of, “clearly established federal
13 law.” *Delgado*, 223 F.3d at 982.

14 When a state court does not furnish a basis for its reasoning, we have no
15 basis other than the record for knowing whether the state court correctly
16 identified the governing legal principle or was extending the principle into a
17 new context. . . .[A]lthough we cannot undertake our review by analyzing the
18 basis for the state court’s decision, we can view it through the ‘objectively
19 reasonable’ lens ground by *Williams* [, 529 U.S. 362]. . . . Federal habeas
review is not *de novo* when the state court does not supply reasoning for its
decision, but an independent review of the record is required to determine
whether the state court clearly erred in its application of controlling federal
law. . . . Only by that examination may we determine whether the state
court’s decision was objectively reasonable.

20 *Id.*

21 DISCUSSION

22 A. Legal Standards

23 1. Ineffective Assistance of Counsel Following a Guilty Plea

24 The Sixth Amendment to the United States Constitution guarantees the effective
25 assistance of counsel. To support a claim of ineffective assistance of counsel, a petitioner
26 must make a two-part showing. First, he must establish that, considering all the
27 circumstances, counsel’s performance fell below an objective standard of reasonableness.
28 See *Strickland v. Washington*, 466 U.S. 668, 687-88 (1984). Second, he must

1 demonstrate that he was prejudiced by counsel's deficient performance. *Id.* at 693-94.
2 Prejudice is found where "there is a reasonable probability that, but for counsel's
3 unprofessional errors, the result of the proceeding would have been different." *Id.* at 694.

4 Where a defendant voluntarily and intelligently pleads guilty to a criminal charge, he
5 cannot later raise in habeas corpus proceedings independent claims relating to the
6 deprivation of constitutional rights that occurred before the plea of guilty. *Haring v. Prosise*,
7 462 U.S. 306, 319-20 (1983) (guilty plea forecloses consideration of pre-plea constitutional
8 deprivations); *Tollett v. Henderson*, 411 U.S. 258, 267 (1973) (same); *Hudson v. Moran*,
9 760 F.2d 1027, 1029-30 (9th Cir. 1985) (no constitutional violation where defendant was
10 not informed that guilty plea would foreclose subsequent habeas relief). A plea of nolo
11 contendere has the same effect as a plea of guilty. See *Ortberg v. Moody*, 961 F.2d 135,
12 137 (9th Cir. 1992) ("petitioner's nolo contendere plea precludes him from challenging
13 alleges constitutional violations that occurred prior to the entry of that plea").

14 A criminal defendant who pleads guilty may not collaterally challenge a voluntary
15 and intelligent guilty plea entered into with the advice of competent counsel. *United States*
16 *v. Broce*, 488 U.S. 563, 574 (1989). The only challenge left open in federal habeas corpus
17 after a guilty plea is a challenge to the voluntary and intelligent character of the plea based
18 on the nature of the advice of counsel to plead. *Hill v. Lockhart*, 474 U.S. 52, 56-57 (1985).
19 A defendant who pleads guilty on advice of counsel may attack the voluntary and intelligent
20 character of the guilty plea only by showing that the advice he received from counsel was
21 not within the range of competence demanded of attorneys in criminal cases. *Tollett*, 411
22 U.S. at 266-67; *Lambert v. Blodgett*, 393 F.3d 943, 979-80 (9th Cir. 2004). He must also
23 show a reasonable probability that but for counsel's errors, he would not have pleaded
24 guilty and would have insisted on going to trial. *Strickland*, 466 U.S. at 688; see also *Hill*,
25 474 U.S. at 58-59.

26 **2. Relevant State Law and Procedures**

27 **a. Detainers**

28 A "detainer" is a notification filed with the institution in which a prisoner is serving a

United States District Court
For the Northern District of California

1 sentence, advising that he is wanted to face pending criminal charges in another
2 jurisdiction. *United States v. Mauro*, 436 U.S. 340, 359 (1978). However, the lodging of a
3 detainer is more than mere notice that an inmate is wanted in another jurisdiction. A
4 detainer asks the institution to "hold the prisoner for the agency or to notify the agency
5 when release of the prisoner is imminent." *People v. Oiknine*, 79 Cal.App.4th 21, 23 (Cal.
6 Ct. App. 1999). A "formal detainer" must be filed before an inmate may invoke the
7 provisions of the Interstate Agreement on Detainers ("IAD"). *People v. Rhoden*, 216 Cal.
8 App.3d 1242, 1251 (Cal. Ct. App. 1989).

9 California Penal Code § 1389 represents the state's codification of the IAD. It
10 establishes a procedure by which a prisoner against whom a detainer has been lodged
11 may demand trial within 180 days of a written request for final disposition properly delivered
12 to the prosecutor and appropriate court of the prosecutor's jurisdiction. Cal. Penal Code §
13 1389, art. III. California Penal Code § 1389, art. III provides in pertinent part:

14 (a) Whenever a person has entered upon a term of imprisonment in a penal
15 or correctional institution of a party state, and whenever during the
16 continuance of the term of imprisonment there is pending in any other party
17 state any untried indictment, information or complaint on the basis of which a
18 detainer has been lodged against the prisoner, he shall be brought to trial
19 within one hundred eighty days after he shall have caused to be delivered to
20 the prosecuting officer and the appropriate court of the prosecuting officer's
21 jurisdiction written notice of the place of his imprisonment and his request for
22 a final disposition to be made of the indictment, information or complaint:
23 provided that for good cause shown in open court, the prisoner or his counsel
24 being present, the court having jurisdiction of the matter may grant any
25 necessary or reasonable continuance. The request of the prisoner shall be
26 accompanied by a certificate of the appropriate official having custody of the
27 prisoner, stating the term of commitment under which the prisoner is being
28 held, the time already served, the time remaining to be served on the
sentence, the amount of good time earned, the time of parole eligibility of the
prisoner, and any decisions of the state parole agency relating to the prisoner.

23 (b) The written notice and request for final disposition referred to in paragraph
24 (a) hereof shall be given or sent by the prisoner to the warden, commissioner
25 of corrections or other official having custody of him, who shall promptly
forward it together with the certificate to the appropriate prosecuting official
and court by registered or certified mail, return receipt requested.

26 (c) The warden, commissioner of corrections or other official having custody
27 of the prisoner shall promptly inform him of the source and contents of any
28 detainer lodged against him and shall also inform him of his right to make a
request for final disposition of the indictment, information or complaint on
which the detainer is based.

1 (d) Any request for final disposition made by a prisoner pursuant to paragraph
2 (a) hereof shall operate as a request for final disposition of all untried
3 indictments, informations or complaints on the basis of which detainees have
4 been lodged against the prisoner from the state to whose prosecuting official
5 the request for final disposition is specifically directed. The warden,
6 commissioner of corrections or other official having custody of the prisoner
7 shall forthwith notify all appropriate prosecuting officers and courts in the
8 several jurisdictions within the state to which the prisoner's request for final
9 disposition is being sent of the proceeding being initiated by the prisoner. Any
10 notification sent pursuant to this paragraph shall be accompanied by copies of
11 the prisoner's written notice, request, and the certificate. If trial is not had on
12 any indictment, information or complaint contemplated hereby prior to the
13 return of the prisoner to the original place of imprisonment, such indictment,
14 information or complaint shall not be of any further force or effect, and the
15 court shall enter an order dismissing the same with prejudice.

16 (e) Any request for final disposition made by a prisoner pursuant to paragraph
17 (a) hereof shall also be deemed to be a waiver of extradition with respect to
18 any charge or proceeding contemplated thereby or included therein by reason
19 of paragraph (d) hereof, and a waiver of extradition to the receiving state to
20 serve any sentence there imposed upon him, after completion of his term of
21 imprisonment in the sending state. The request for final disposition shall also
22 constitute a consent by the prisoner to the production of his body in any court
23 where his presence may be required in order to effectuate the purposes of
24 this agreement and a further consent voluntarily to be returned to the original
25 place of imprisonment in accordance with the provisions of this agreement.
26 Nothing in this paragraph shall prevent the imposition of a concurrent
27 sentence if otherwise permitted by law.

28 (f) Escape from custody by the prisoner subsequent to his execution of the
1 request for final disposition referred to in paragraph (a) hereof shall void the
2 request.

3 The IAD, in turn, also gives a state the right to obtain a prisoner for purposes of trial,
4 in which case the state must try the prisoner within 120 days of his arrival in the state, and
5 must not return the prisoner to his original place of imprisonment prior to that trial. *Id.*, art.
6 IV; see also *Alabama v. Bozeman*, 533 U.S. 146, 148-50 (2001). That article provides:

7 (a) The appropriate officer of the jurisdiction in which an untried indictment,
8 information or complaint is pending shall be entitled to have a prisoner
9 against whom he has lodged a detainer and who is serving a term of
10 imprisonment in any party state made available in accordance with Article
11 V(a) hereof upon presentation of a written request for temporary custody or
12 availability to the appropriate authorities of the state in which the prisoner is
13 incarcerated: provided that the court having jurisdiction of such indictment,
14 information or complaint shall have duly approved, recorded and transmitted
15 the request: and provided further that there shall be a period of thirty days
16 after receipt by the appropriate authorities before the request be honored,
17 within which period the governor of the sending state may disapprove the
18 request for temporary custody or availability, either upon his own motion or
19 upon motion of the prisoner.

1 (b) Upon receipt of the officer's written request as provided in paragraph (a)
 2 hereof, the appropriate authorities having the prisoner in custody shall furnish
 3 the officer with a certificate stating the term of commitment under which the
 4 prisoner is being held, the time already served, the time remaining to be
 5 served on the sentence, the amount of good time earned, the time of parole
 6 eligibility of the prisoner, and any decisions of the state parole agency relating
 7 to the prisoner. Said authorities simultaneously shall furnish all other officers
 8 and appropriate courts in the receiving state who have lodged detainees
 9 against the prisoner with similar certificates and with notices informing them
 10 of the request for custody or availability and of the reasons therefor.

11 (c) In respect of any proceeding made possible by this Article, trial shall be
 12 commenced within one hundred twenty days of the arrival of the prisoner in
 13 the receiving state, but for good cause shown in open court, the prisoner or
 14 his counsel being present, the court having jurisdiction of the matter may
 15 grant any necessary or reasonable continuance.

16 (d) Nothing contained in this Article shall be construed to deprive any prisoner
 17 of any right which he may have to contest the legality of his delivery as
 18 provided in paragraph (a) hereof, but such delivery may not be opposed or
 19 denied on the ground that the executive authority of the sending state has not
 20 affirmatively consented to or ordered such delivery.

21 (e) If trial is not had on any indictment, information or complaint contemplated
 22 hereby prior to the prisoner's being returned to the original place of
 23 imprisonment pursuant to Article V(e) hereof, such indictment, information or
 24 complaint shall not be of any further force or effect, and the court shall enter
 25 an order dismissing the same with prejudice.

26 Cal. Penal Code § 1389, art. iv.

27 If the state¹ receiving the detainer request fails to act in compliance with the IAD, or
 28 "in the event that an action on the indictment, information or complaint on the basis of
 1 which the detainer has been lodged is not brought to trial within the period provided in
 2 Article III or Article IV," an order shall be entered dismissing the pending criminal charges
 3 with prejudice. Cal. Penal Code § 1389, art. V(c); see, e.g., *Mauro*, 436 U.S. at 364;
 4 *People v. Brooks*, 189 Cal.App.3d 866, 872 (Cal. Ct. App. 1987). In order to take
 5 advantage of the sanction of dismissal, however, the prisoner must strictly comply with the
 6 procedural requirements of the IAD. *People v. Garner*, 224 Cal.App.3d 1363, 1371 (Cal.
 7 Ct. App. 1990); *Rhoden*, 216 Cal.App.3d at 1252.

29 ////

27 ¹ "State" includes "a state of the United States; the United States of America; a territory
 28 or possession of the United States; the District of Columbia; the Commonwealth of Puerto
 Rico." Cal. Penal Code § 1389, art. II.

1 **b. Speedy Trial Rights**

2 California Penal Code § 1381.5, which is part of California's Speedy Trial Act,
3 permits federal prisoners with criminal proceedings pending in California courts to request
4 to be brought to trial or to be sentenced in the state proceeding within 90 days of making
5 the request. If the defendant is not brought to trial or for sentencing as provided by §
6 1381.5, the court in which the action is pending "shall . . . dismiss the action." Cal. Penal
7 Code § 1381.5.

8 **c. Relationship between Speedy Trial Rights and IAD Rights**

9 Where the defendant is a federal prisoner, California Penal Code section 1381.5,
10 governing speedy trial rights, and section 1389, governing IAD rights, might both apply.
11 While a dismissal under section 1389 for failure to comply with the statutory IAD time limits
12 constitutes a dismissal *with* prejudice, that is not the case for a dismissal related to a
13 speedy trial violation under section 1381.5. See *Selfa v. Superior Court*, 109 Cal.App.3d
14 182 (Cal. Ct. App. 1980); *People v. Cella*, 114 Cal.App.3d 905 (Cal. Ct. App. 1981).

15 As a general rule, in California, an order dismissing an action for violation of the
16 speedy trial statute is a bar to further prosecution for the same offense if it is a
17 misdemeanor, but not if it is a felony or a misdemeanor joined with a felony. 5 Witkin,
18 California Criminal Law, Criminal Trials § 327 (3d ed. 2000). Therefore, a new felony
19 action may ordinarily be instituted after the dismissal and within the period of the statute of
20 limitations. In *Crockett v. Superior Court*, 14 Cal. 3d 433, 436 (Cal. 1975), the California
21 Supreme Court explained as follows:

22 Section 1387 provides that an order of dismissal of a criminal charge is not "a
23 bar to any other prosecution for the same offense . . . if it is a felony."
24 Included in such orders of dismissal are those granted by reason of the fact
25 that the defendant was not brought to trial within statutory time limits.
Although the right to a speedy trial is grounded in both the United States and
California Constitutions, the timely refiling of charges once dismissed for
denial of a speedy trial has been deemed constitutionally permissible absent
a showing by the accused of actual prejudice.

26
27 In *Selfa*, the California Court of Appeal held that in cases where sections 1381.5 and
28 1389 both apply, the 90-day period of section 1381.5 prevails. 109 Cal. App.3d at 186. In

1 harmonizing the two statutes, which contain different deadlines, the court noted that “a
2 more specific statute will normally control over a general one.” *Id.* at 188. It held that
3 section 1389 was the “more general” of the two statutes, in contrast to the speedy trial
4 statute, section 1381.5, which “applies specifically to California, and focuses upon the right
5 of prisoners in federal institutions in our state to the same 90-day trial right as provided
6 prisoners in state institutions.” *Id.*

7 **B. Petitioner’s Habeas Claim**

8 **1. Background**

9 At the time the state charges in this case were initially filed on May 3, 2001, Dryg
10 was in the custody of the Federal Bureau of Prisons at the Federal Correctional Institution
11 in Lompoc, California, serving the sentence on his federal conviction for traveling in
12 interstate commerce for the purpose of engaging in sexual acts with a person under 18
13 years-old, imposed by the district court in the Northern District of Illinois. On May 29, 2001,
14 the Santa Clara County District Attorney lodged a detainer with the federal warden.

15 Subsequently, on June 12, 2001, Dryg wrote a letter to Santa Clara County District
16 Attorney George Kennedy, stating that he would be released from federal custody no later
17 than September 27, 2002. Suppl. Exh. G. Dryg then asked whether the district attorney
18 “could . . be so kind as to continue [the state case] until that time?” *Id.* On August 17,
19 2001, the Santa Clara County District Attorney nevertheless mailed the warden at FCI
20 Lompoc a “Form V Request for Temporary Custody” pursuant to California Penal Code §
21 1389, which the federal prison received on August 20, 2001.

22 A few days later, on August 23, 2001, Dryg filed a request with the federal prison
23 that Santa Clara County be denied temporary custody. Suppl. Exh. K. Subsequently, on
24 September 9, 2001, a manager at the federal prison called the Santa Clara County district
25 attorney’s office and spoke with a legal clerk. The manager told the clerk that Dryg wanted
26 to stay in federal custody until his release date, and that he wanted to speak to a deputy
27 district attorney. Clerk’s Transcripts (“C.T.”) 176. Supervising deputy district attorney,
28 Victoria Brown, returned the call and spoke with Cheryl Hyatt, a case manager at the

1 federal prison. Hyatt confirmed that Dryg requested to serve out his federal sentence, and
2 that he had expressed concern regarding adequate time to prepare his state case. C.T.
3 177.

4 On September 14, 2001, Dryg received a response to his request that Santa Clara
5 County be denied temporary custody. Supp. Exh. K. The federal warden stated in that
6 response:

7 In investigating this matter, the required paperwork has not been received to
8 initiate a temporary custody transfer to Santa Clara County. Therefore, in
9 according to Program Statement 5130.06, Detainers and the Interstate
Agreement on Detainers Act, dated March 1, 1999, you are not eligible for
transfer at this time.

10 Suppl. Exh. K. In effect, this response reassured Dryg that he wouldn't be transferred in
11 the near future.

12 Approximately five months later, on February 6, 2002, Dryg signed a form entitled
13 "Notice and Demand for Trial Pursuant to California Penal Code § 1381.5 [California's
14 speedy trial statute] by a Person in Federal Custody." The form was mailed to the Santa
15 Clara District Attorney, where it was received on February 11, 2002, and was filed in the
16 Santa Clara Superior Court on February 19, 2002.

17 On May 31, 2002, Dryg filed a pro se motion to dismiss, asserting that the
18 prosecution had violated the statutory time limits of both the speedy trial statute and
19 California's IAD statute, Penal Code §§ 1381.5 and 1389, art. IV. Regarding the IAD, Dryg
20 argued now – contrary to his prior objections to any transfer pursuant to § 1389 – that the
21 state was required to try him within 180 days of the district attorney's August 2001 request
22 for temporary custody, which would have been around February 11, 2002. Dryg also
23 argued that the state violated his speedy trial rights under § 1381.5 by failing to bring him to
24 trial by early May 2002, ninety days from February 6, 2002, the date that Dryg filed his
25 notice and demand for trial pursuant to that statute.

26 In July 2002, the state called the federal prison to inquire regarding the status of its
27 request for temporary custody, and was told that Dryg refused to complete and sign the
28 necessary paperwork for his release, and thus could not be transferred to state custody.

United States District Court
For the Northern District of California

1 Reporter's Transcripts ("R.T.") at 35-36; C.T. 177. Apparently, Dryg refused to sign forms
2 that would release him for trial on at least two occasions. R.T. 40, R.T. 53-54; C.T. 177.
3 Additionally, Dryg again wrote to District Attorney George Kennedy on September 18,
4 2002, communicating that he was "not terribly interested in going to trial [at the time]," and
5 that the state could continue his trial until his release. R.T. 41.²

6 Dryg ultimately remained in federal custody at FCI Lompoc until he had finished
7 serving his federal sentence on September 27, 2002, when he was placed in the custody of
8 the Santa Clara County Superior Court. On November 13, 2002, Dryg waived time. C.T.
9 178. Apparently, an information was not filed until June 30, 2003. R.T. 36. After Dryg was
10 brought to Santa Clara County, he was arraigned, entered a not guilty plea, and was
11 subsequently released from custody on bail.

12 Santa Clara County Superior Court Judge Marc Poche held a two-day hearing on
13 Dryg's motion to dismiss, filed in May 2002, on August 29, 2003 and September 3, 2003.
14 In the meantime, Dryg had retained counsel, Jerome Mullins, who represented him at the
15 hearings. The court heard argument all day on August 29, 2003. Dryg admitted a number
16 of exhibits, A-V, in conjunction with the hearing.³ The court then continued the hearing to
17 September 3, 2003 to provide it and the parties additional time to consider the relevant
18 authority.

19 Following an additional lengthy hearing on September 3, 2003, the court granted
20 Dryg's motion to dismiss, but without prejudice. The court found that the 90-day limit of §
21 1381.5, the speedy trial statute – not the 120-day limit of § 1389 – applied, based on the
22 rule articulated in *Selfa*. 109 Cal.App.3d at 188 (where prisoner's demand for speedy trial

23
24 ²At the August 29, 2003 hearing, Dryg's counsel, Mullins, argued that it was irrelevant
25 that Dryg may have subsequently indicated a desire to remain in federal custody instead of
26 proceeding to trial on the state charges. R.T. 43. Mullins argued that once Dryg made the
27 demand for a speedy trial on February 6, 2002, the state must honor that request and the
defendant is not subsequently able to withdraw his request for a speedy trial other than
through an open court waiver of his speedy trial right. R.T. 44-45.

28 ³The court has referred to those exhibits, a part of the record before this court, as
"supplemental exhibits."

1 complies with both § 1381.5 and § 1389, 90-day period provided by § 1381.5 controls over
2 180-day period provided by § 1389). The court noted that under Penal Code § 1387, the
3 dismissal would be without prejudice. The court also indicated that were it not for the
4 *Selfa* rule, it would have found that Dryg made a proper demand under Article III of the IAD,
5 section 1389, and that the dismissal would have been with prejudice. Finally, the court
6 suggested on the record that perhaps an extraordinary writ should be explored. R.T. 91.

7 Dryg, however, did not file an appeal or seek an extraordinary writ following the trial
8 court's September 3, 2003 dismissal without prejudice. He asserts that this was because
9 "the prosecution did not immediately re-file the charges." Petition at ¶ 19. According to
10 Dryg, he does not fault his then-attorney, Jerome Mullins' failure to seek post-dismissal
11 relief because "there was no basis to file an appeal." *Id.* Dryg concedes that when the
12 district attorney re-filed the felony charges against him approximately forty days later on
13 October 14, 2003, "the time for filing an appeal from the first case had passed." *Id.*⁴

14 After the charges were re-filed on October 14, 2003, Dryg made his first appearance
15 on November 11, 2003, and represented himself at the preliminary hearing on December 2,
16 2003.⁵ On December 16, 2003, the state filed the information, and Dryg was arraigned on
17 December 22, 2003, at which time he signed an application to represent himself. On
18 January 14, 2004, however, Dryg decided to seek another attorney.

19 On February 4, 2004, Dryg retained attorney Guyton Jinkerson, and filed a demurrer
20 to the charges, on the ground that the three-year statute of limitations had run,⁶ and also
21 based on the fact that the information failed to provide any justification for an extension of
22 the limitations period. On February 18, 2004, the trial court sustained Dryg's demurrer, but

23
24 ⁴The court thus notes that it is clear that Dryg does *not* claim here, nor did he ever raise
25 the issue before the state courts, that *Mullins'* failure to file an appeal or seek an extraordinary
writ of the September 3, 2003 dismissal without prejudice constituted ineffective assistance of
counsel.

26 ⁵In the current petition, Dryg simply states that he was "unable to retain Mr. Mullins" for
27 the second prosecution. Petition at ¶ 20.

28 ⁶ Under California Penal Code § 803, the statute of limitations on the charged offenses
was three years.

1 granted the prosecution's request to amend the information in order to address the statute
2 of limitations issue. The state filed its first amended information on February 18, 2004.

3 On March 17, 2004, Dryg subsequently filed another demurrer to the first amended
4 information, again arguing that the state failed to allege that the statute of limitations for the
5 charged offenses had been tolled. C.T. 92. In an order issued April 7, 2004, Santa Clara
6 County Superior Court Judge Kevin Murphy found that the prior prosecution for the same
7 offenses tolled the statute of limitations. C.T. 115-119. The superior court noted that there
8 had been approximately three months and ten days left in the limitations period at the time
9 the first prosecution began on May 3, 2001 (the date of issuance of the original warrant);
10 that the limitation period was tolled until the first prosecution was terminated on September
11 3, 2003; and that the second prosecution began on October 28, 2003 (the date of issuance
12 of the new arrest warrant). Because the elapsed time between September 3, 2003, and
13 October 28, 2003, was less than the number of days left in the limitations period, the court
14 concluded that the limitations period had not yet run. However, the court agreed with Dryg
15 that on its face, the amended information failed to plead facts indicating that the charges
16 were not barred by the statute of limitations. The court therefore granted the prosecution
17 leave to amend again so that the information would facially comply with the statute of
18 limitations, and denied Dryg's demurrer in all other respects.

19 On April 7, 2004, Dryg filed a "once in jeopardy" plea. Subsequently, on April 28,
20 2004, Dryg filed another motion to dismiss the information based on speedy trial violations.
21 C.T. 129. In support, Dryg argued that based on California case law, *Zimmerman v.*
22 *Superior Court*, 248 Cal.App.2d 56, 62 (Cal. Ct. App. 1967), the charges contained in the
23 information should be dismissed based on the state's failure to respond to Dryg's §§ 1381.5
24 and 1389 demands for a speedy trial. Dryg further argued that the statute of limitations
25 should not be tolled during the time between May 2002, when he filed his first motion to
26 dismiss pursuant to §§ 1381.5 and 1389, and September 2003, when the trial court finally
27 heard his motion. Dryg also argued that it was the state's burden to establish good cause
28 for the delay upon refiling charges after the speedy trial dismissal in September 2003.

1 Alternatively, Dryg argued that he had suffered actual prejudice as a result of the delay due
2 to the loss of: (1) physical evidence, (2) favorable evidence, (3) material witnesses, and (4)
3 the opportunity to receive concurrent sentences and other procedural rights. C.T. 138.

4 The state opposed Dryg's motion, and noted that one of the reasons that he was not
5 released from federal custody until September 2002 was because the state never received
6 the required documents from the federal prison granting it temporary custody of him, as
7 required by § 1381.5, and thus the state was unable to complete the required forms to
8 transport Dryg to Santa Clara County. C.T. 177. The state further noted that one of the
9 reasons that it did not receive the requisite documents was because Dryg refused to sign
10 them. *Id.*

11 As for the law, the state argued that after a dismissal on speedy trial grounds
12 pursuant to § 1381.5, it was the *defendant's* burden to show actual prejudice, and not the
13 state's burden to show good cause at the time of refiling the criminal charges. The state
14 further argued that Dryg had not shown actual prejudice.

15 Santa Clara County Superior Court Judge Randolph Rice heard Dryg's motion to
16 dismiss on June 25, 2004. The court denied Dryg's motion, concluding that the time period
17 at issue was indeed statutorily tolled. However, the court denied without prejudice, and
18 declined to rule on the issue regarding whether the delay prejudiced Dryg, determining that
19 the issue was "more properly heard by the trial judge who hears the evidence in this case."
20 June 25, 2004 Transcripts at 14.

21 However, on July 20, 2004, Dryg entered a plea of no contest to all three charges.
22 Subsequently, on August 26, 2004, Dryg filed a motion to arrest judgment, arguing that
23 each charge in the amended information was barred by the statute of limitations, and that
24 the statute of limitations was not tolled by the filing of the arrest warrant on May 3, 2001,
25 because the case was dismissed. Dryg also renewed the arguments he had made in
26 connection with his April 28, 2004 motion to dismiss based on the alleged violations of
27 Penal Code §§ 1381.5 and 1389. On September 30, 2004, the superior court denied the
28 motion to arrest judgment and imposed sentence pursuant to the terms of the plea

1 agreement.

2 That same day, on September 30, 2004, Dryg filed a notice of appeal, appealing the
3 trial court's: (1) April 7, 2004 order overruling his demurrer to the first amended information;
4 (2) June 25, 2004 denial of his motion to dismiss; (3) September 30, 2004 denial of his
5 motion to arrest of judgment; and (4) September 30, 2004 order granting probation.
6 Subsequently, on November 24, 2004, current federal habeas counsel, Andrew Parnes,
7 filed an application for issuance of a certificate of probable cause on Dryg's behalf. In that
8 application, Dryg asserted that there were reasonable constitutional or jurisdictional
9 grounds regarding the legality of the proceeding for review on appeal that were not related
10 to a challenge of the validity of the plea itself. C.T. 328. He contended that these issues
11 included whether the statute of limitations was violated, and whether the state complied
12 with Penal Code §§ 1381.5 and 1389.

13 On November 29, 2004, the Superior Court summarily denied the application for a
14 certificate of probable cause, and the California Court of Appeal subsequently dismissed
15 the appeal on December 15, 2005.

16 On March 23, 2006, Dryg filed a petition for writ of habeas corpus in the Santa
17 Clara Superior Court. In that petition, Dryg alleged that Jinkerson was ineffective for failing
18 to argue that the re-filed charges should have been dismissed with prejudice pursuant to §
19 1389 and for failing to preserve that issue for appeal. In spite of the fact that the same
20 court had previously denied a certificate of probable cause on the issues, the superior court
21 nevertheless addressed Dryg's claims on the merits on habeas review. It found that Dryg's
22 February 2002 speedy trial request under § 1381.5 failed to comply with the requirements
23 of Penal Code § 1389, and that Dryg was therefore not entitled to seek a dismissal with
24 prejudice under § 1389. The court concluded that Jinkerson was therefore not ineffective
25 for failing to "resurrect" the § 1389 dismissal claim, or for failing to obtain a certificate of
26 probable cause on the issue.

27 Dryg subsequently sought reconsideration of the superior court's order denying him
28 habeas relief. Dryg argued in the motion that "at a pre-trial proceeding, the trial judge

1 found that [Dryg's] notice did comply with the requirements of a § 1389 motion and that the
2 court [was] bound to give that decision effect under the doctrines of res judicata and
3 collateral estoppel." Exh. C at 228-29.⁷ In denying Dryg's motion for reconsideration, the
4 court noted that under state law, there was no "law of the case" preventing it from
5 concluding that the trial court had erred to the extent that it believed Dryg met the
6 requirements of a § 1389 motion. Exh. C at 229. The court further noted the problems with
7 Dryg's argument, asserting that if Dryg "were correct, then the doctrines of res judicata and
8 collateral estoppel would [also] necessarily prevent him from challenging, on collateral
9 attack, the trial court's decision to dismiss without prejudice." *Id.*

10 On August 28, 2006, Dryg subsequently filed a petition for writ of habeas corpus
11 before the California Supreme Court, which summarily denied his petition on September
12 27, 2006.

13 2. Analysis

14 As this court noted in its January 18, 2007 order to show cause, because Dryg
15 pleaded guilty, he cannot simply raise *any* ineffective assistance of counsel claim he
16 chooses. Dryg waived any claims for ineffective assistance of counsel based on conduct
17 that occurred *prior* to the entry of his no contest plea on July 20, 2004. The only claims
18 that Dryg may now raise concern: (1) counsel's omissions and/or conduct that occurred
19 *after* the entry of his plea; and/or (2) advice that Dryg received in connection with his
20 decision to plead no contest that rendered his plea involuntary.

21 In its January 18, 2007 order to show cause, the court liberally construed Dryg's
22 petition and accompanying declaration to set forth such cognizable claim(s). However, the
23 court expressed concern regarding whether or not Dryg had exhausted such claim(s)
24 before the state courts, and required briefing on the issue. Again, on July 10, 2007, the

25
26 ⁷Presumably, the "finding" to which Dryg referred in his motion for reconsideration was
27 a statement made by Superior Court Judge Poche on September 3, 2003 in dismissing the
28 case without prejudice. See R.T. at 183 ("My view [is] that 1389 was violated in the sense that
[Dryg] made his demand in the proper forum, the proper way and he was not brought to trial
within the time limits set forth within.").

1 court ruled in Dryg's favor, liberally construing his California Supreme Court habeas petition
2 – which included the claim that his trial counsel rendered ineffective assistance by not
3 properly raising and preserving his challenge to the Interstate Agreement on Detainers – to
4 have nevertheless exhausted the above cognizable post-no contest plea claim(s), and
5 allowed for briefing on the merits.

6 Unfortunately, in the briefing that followed this court's July 10, 2007 order, the
7 parties, especially Dryg, have to a large degree argued Dryg's ineffective assistance of
8 counsel sub-claims as straightforward ones for ineffective assistance of counsel, rather
9 than framing them in light of the appropriate legal standards given the fact that Dryg
10 pleaded no contest. Upon close review, the majority of Dryg's arguments do not concern
11 his counsel's post-plea performance or advice that he received from counsel *in conjunction*
12 *with his no contest plea*, but instead concern his counsel's performance prior to the entry of
13 his plea. Because those arguments were waived by Dryg's no contest plea, the court
14 declines to address them.

15 The waived, non-cognizable sub-claims include Dryg's argument that Jinkerson
16 provided ineffective assistance of counsel by failing to pursue detainer challenges prior to
17 the entry of his guilty plea, by specifically (a) failing to renew the motion to dismiss under §
18 1389 after the charges were re-filed; (b) failing to argue under *Zimmerman v. Superior
Court*, 248 Cal. App. 2d 56 (1967), that it was "unreasonable" to permit the prosecution to
19 file a new complaint on the same charges after the expiration of the statute of limitations
20 when the prosecution was at fault for not bringing him to trial within the 180 days required
21 under § 1389, art. III, or within the 120 days required under § 1389, art. IV; (c) failing to
22 argue a claim based on petitioner's alleged "once in jeopardy" plea; and (d) failing to argue
23 that even before Dryg filed his Art. III section 1389 request, he was entitled to dismissal
24 under Article IV section 1389.

25 By contrast, the only cognizable sub-claims raised by Dryg include his arguments
26 that Jinkerson provided ineffective assistance of counsel by: (a) failing to inform him that a
27 certificate of probable cause was necessary for him to appeal certain claims if he pleaded
28

1 guilty or no contest; (b) failing to inform him that he could pursue a petition for writ of
2 mandate or prohibition before trial on the detainer-related issues; and (c) failing to properly
3 preserve issues regarding the detainer for appeal.

4 In a declaration that he filed with this court and with his habeas petitions before the
5 state courts, Dryg attests that his counsel, Jinkerson “knew that I believed that my rights
6 under *Zimmerman* and [Penal Code § 1389, arts. III & IV] had been violated, and that I
7 wished to pursue this legal issue to the higher courts.” Exh. O, Petition. He also asserts
8 that Jinkerson told him that all of his appellate rights would be preserved if he pled no
9 contest. Dryg further asserts that “[o]n advice of counsel, and clearly believing my appeal
10 rights were indeed preserved and would survive a guilty plea, I did so consent to plead
11 guilty.” Finally, he attests that Jinkerson’s assessment of the legal issues and his advice
12 that Dryg’s issues would be preserved for appeal were “the only factors I considered
13 regarding my decision to accept the guilty plea in the trial court.” *Id.*

14 **a. Failure to Preserve Issues for Appeal**

15 Dryg asserts that although Jinkerson filed a notice of appeal, he did not properly
16 preserve his issues for appeal. Reply at 5. To the extent that Dryg is arguing that
17 Jinkerson failed to file a request for a certificate of probable cause, any such failure was not
18 prejudicial because Dryg’s current federal habeas counsel filed a timely request for such a
19 certificate.

20 As noted above, on September 30, 2004, the same day that the trial court denied
21 Dryg’s post-plea motion to arrest judgment, Jinkerson filed a notice of appeal on Dryg’s
22 behalf, listing several issues. Jinkerson, however, did not file a request for a certificate of
23 probable cause.

24 In the case of a judgment of conviction following a guilty plea, California Penal Code
25 section 1237.5 authorizes an appeal only as to a particular category of issues and requires
26 that steps in addition to filing a notice of appeal be taken. *In re Chavez*, 30 Cal. 4th 643,
27
28

1 650 (Cal. 2003).⁸ In order to challenge any issues concerning the validity of a guilty plea, a
2 defendant must first obtain a certificate of probable cause from the trial court, and an
3 appeal of any such issues will not be operative unless the defendant does so. See *id.* The
4 procedural requirement is applied in a “strict manner,” *People v. Mendez*, 19 Cal. 4th 1084,
5 1096-97 (Cal. 1999), “regardless of other procedural challenges being made.” *Chavez*, 30
6 Cal. 4th at 650. “For example, a defendant who has filed a motion to withdraw a guilty plea
7 that has been denied by the trial court must still secure a certificate of probable cause in
8 order to challenge on appeal the validity of the guilty plea.” *Id.*

The purpose in requiring a certificate of probable cause following guilty pleas is "to promote judicial economy by screening out wholly frivolous guilty plea appeals before time and money are spent on such matters as the preparation of the record on appeal, the appointment of appellate counsel, and, of course, consideration and decision of the appeal itself." *Chavez*, 30 Cal. 4th at 651 (quoting *Mendez*, 19 Cal. 4th at 1095). Under section 1237.5, the trial court has the discretion to deny a certificate when an appeal would raise frivolous and vexatious issues. *People v. Hoffard*, 10 Cal. 4th 1170, 1178-79 (Cal. 1995); see also *Ramis v. People*, 74 Cal.App.3d 325, 376 (Cal. Ct. App. 1977) (concluding that superior court did not abuse its discretion in denying certificate of probable cause where the record indicated that defendant did not have any grounds for setting aside his plea); *People v. Nigro*, 39 Cal.App.3d 506 (Cal. Ct. App. 1974) (concluding that record supported trial court's denial of certificate where it showed that in pleading nolo contendere, defendant conceded that he "knew quite well" what he was doing and did not support defendant's

⁸Section 1237.5 provides:

No appeal shall be taken by the defendant from a judgment of conviction upon a plea of guilty or nolo contendre, or a revocation of probation following an admission of violation, except where both of the following are met:

(a) The defendant has filed with the trial court a written statement, executed under oath or penalty of perjury showing reasonable constitutional, jurisdictional, or other grounds going to the legality of the proceedings.

(b) The trial court has executed and filed a certificate of probable cause for such appeal with the clerk of the court.

1 vague, subjective feeling of pressure or coercion).

2 At the time that Dryg appealed to the California courts, former California Rule of
3 Court 31(d) set forth the applicable deadlines, as well as other conditions, for filing a
4 request for a certificate for probable cause, and provided in pertinent part:

5 If a judgment of conviction is entered upon a plea of guilty or nolo contendere,
6 the defendant shall, within 60 days after the judgment is rendered, file as an
7 intended notice of appeal the statement required by section 1237.5 of the
8 Penal Code; but the appeal shall not be operative unless the trial court
9 executes and files the certificate of probable cause required by that section.
Within 20 days after the defendant files the statement the trial court shall
execute and file either a certificate of probable cause or an order denying a
certificate and shall forthwith notify the parties of the granting or denial of the
certificate.⁹

10 Although Jinkerson did not file a request for such a certificate, Dryg's current
11 counsel subsequently filed a timely request, which the superior court subsequently
12 considered and denied on the merits. Petition, Exh. K. Accordingly, Jinkerson's failure to
13 request such a certificate did not prejudice Dryg. Moreover, to the extent that this claim is
14 a veiled attempt to argue that Jinkerson's performance prior to Dryg's plea was ineffective,
15 this claim is not cognizable for the reasons stated above.

16 **b. Counsel's Advice re: the Necessity of a Certificate of Probable
17 Cause and the Possibility of a Petition for Writ of Mandate or
Prohibition**

18 Because Dryg's current counsel filed a timely request for a certificate of probable
19 cause, which was adjudicated by the state court on the merits, Dryg's argument cannot be
20 that Jinkerson's failure to inform him of the necessity of the certificate prevented him from
21 timely seeking one. Instead, although it is not clear, it appears that Dryg's argument is that
22 he would have preferred to raise the issues contained in his application for a certificate of
23 probable cause via a writ of prohibition or mandamus prior to trial, or perhaps on direct
24 appeal, if possible, as opposed to having the issues screened for frivolity as they are prior
25
26

27

⁹After Dryg's appeal, the Judicial Council of California repealed Rule 31(d) and moved
28 its provisions, as amended to former Rule 30(b), effective January 1, 2004. It then
renumbered Rule 30(b), as Rule 8.304(b).

1 to issuance of a certificate of probability.¹⁰ See *Hoffard*, 10 Cal. 4th at 1178-79.

2 Assuming that Jinkerson indeed failed to advise Dryg of the above, the court
3 concludes that Jinkerson's conduct was not deficient, and also that Dryg was not
4 prejudiced by any such failure. First, there is no evidence that Dryg would not have pled
5 guilty had he known that he was required to request a certificate of probable cause. Dryg
6 simply asserts that he pled guilty on counsel's advice that counsel would preserve his
7 appellate rights. As noted above, Dryg's appellate rights were preserved to the maximum
8 extent possible following a guilty plea. Jinkerson simply could not have predicted, nor was
9 he required to predict that the trial court would deny Dryg's request for a certificate of
10 appealability as frivolous. See *Turner v. Calderon*, 281 F.3d 851, 881 (9th Cir. 2002) (in
11 advising a defendant, "[c]ounsel cannot be required to accurately predict what the . . . court
12 might find, but he can be required to give the defendant the tools he needs to make an
13 intelligent decision").

14 Second, to the extent a writ was available to Dryg pre-plea to challenge the trial
15 court's 2003 dismissal without prejudice, the record demonstrates that the request for such
16 writ should have been filed by Mullins - as opposed to Jinkerson. Dryg himself admits that
17 Jinkerson did not enter the case until, in Dryg's view, there was no point in filing an appeal
18 (or presumably a writ). Furthermore, Dryg very clearly has not challenged Mullins'
19 performance as ineffective.

20 Finally, the superior court's denial of the request for the certificate of appealability
21 was *not* the last word on Dryg's detainer-related claims. Dryg raised them in habeas
22 petitions before the state courts, albeit unsuccessfully, and the courts addressed and
23 rejected his claims on the merits.

24 _____
25 ¹⁰In his California Supreme Court petition, Dryg argued that “[t]rial counsel did not inform
26 [him] that he could file a Petition for Writ of Mandamus or Prohibition before trial, if the motion
27 to dismiss had been made and denied in trial court.” Exh. C at 22. However, Dryg altered the
28 argument in the petition filed before this court such that it differs slightly from the argument that
Dryg actually exhausted. In his opening petition before this court, Dryg instead asserts that
“[t]rial counsel informed [him] that . . . there was no need to raise the issue in a Petition for Writ
of Mandate or Prohibition before trial.” Petition at 10. Pursuant, to this court's July 10, 2007
order, the court will adjudicate the issue as exhausted before the state courts.

1 For these reasons, Dryg's claim fails.

2 **C. Request for Evidentiary Hearing and Discovery**

3 In his traverse, Dryg requests that in the event the court "believes that there may
4 have been some strategic reason for [Jinkerson's] failure to raise and preserve the issues
5 for appeal," that he be provided the opportunity to depose Jinkerson. However, because
6 the court concludes that Dryg's appellate rights were preserved to the maximum extent
7 possible following a guilty plea, a deposition would be fruitless, and Dryg's request is
8 therefore DENIED.

9 Dryg also requests an evidentiary hearing on his claims. The requirements of 28
10 U.S.C. § 2254(e)(2), govern requests for evidentiary hearings. See *Cooper-Smith v.*
11 *Palmateer*, 397 F.3d 1236, 1241 (9th Cir. 2005). Section 2254(e)(2) provides:

12 If the applicant has failed to develop the factual basis of a claim in state court
13 proceedings, the court shall not hold an evidentiary hearing unless the
applicant shows that:

14 (A) the claim relies on—

15 (i) a new rule of constitutional law, made retroactive to cases on
collateral review by the Supreme Court, that was previously unavailable; or

16 (ii) a factual predicate that could not have been previously discovered
through the exercise of due diligence; and

17 (B) the facts underlying the claim would be sufficient to establish by clear and
convincing evidence that but for constitutional error, no reasonable factfinder
would have found the applicant guilty of the underlying offense.

18 The United States Supreme Court has interpreted the opening paragraph of the
19 section to provide that where a petitioner has indeed exercised diligence to "develop the
20 factual bases" of his claims in state court, the requirements of section 2254(e)(2)(A)&(B) do
21 not apply to his request for an evidentiary hearing. *Williams v. Taylor*, 529 U.S. 420, 435
22 (2000); *Holland v. Jackson*, 542 U.S. 649, 652-53 (2004). In other words, a petitioner who
23 has exercised such diligence will be taken out of the purview of section 2254(e)(2). *Griffey*
24 *v. Williams*, 345 F.3d 1058 (9th Cir. 2003), vacated on other grounds as moot, 349 F.3d
25 1157 (9th Cir. 2003) (petitioner died); *Williams*, 529 U.S. at 430 (showing under 2254(e)(2)

1 "applies only to prisoners who have 'failed to develop the factual basis of a claim in state
2 court proceedings')."

3 Diligence "depends upon whether petitioner made a reasonable attempt, in light of
4 the information available at the time, to investigate and pursue claims in state court."
5 *Cooper-Smith*, 397 F.3d at 1241 (quoting *Williams*, 529 U.S. at 435). Diligence requires in
6 the usual case that the prisoner, at a minimum, seek an evidentiary hearing in state court in
7 the manner prescribed by state law. *Williams*, 529 U.S. at 435.

8 Dryg did exercise diligence in so far as he requested an evidentiary hearing before
9 the state courts in conjunction with his state habeas petitions. However, even though Dryg
10 may have exercised diligence in making the request before the state court, there is no per
11 se requirement for an evidentiary hearing. *Turner*, 281 F.3d at 890. A petitioner is entitled
12 to an evidentiary hearing on ineffective assistance of counsel claims only if he can
13 demonstrate that, if his allegations were proven at the evidentiary hearing, deficient
14 performance and prejudice would be established. See *id.* Here, the court finds that there
15 is nothing "more an evidentiary hearing might reveal of material import." See *Gandarela v.*
16 *Johnson*, 286 F.3d 1080, 1087 (9th Cir. 2002) (denying petitioner's request for evidentiary
17 hearing regarding his assertion of actual innocence). Because Dryg's claims may be
18 resolved by reference to the state court record and the documentary evidence he has
19 submitted, the court denies his request for an evidentiary hearing. See *Griffey*, 345 F.3d at
20 1067 (even where petitioner had shown diligence entitling him to evidentiary hearing, Ninth
21 Circuit concluded that petitioner was not entitled to evidentiary hearing because his claims
22 could be resolved by reference to the state court record and the documentary evidence he
23 submitted); see also *Campbell v. Wood*, 18 F.3d 662, 679 (9th Cir. 1994).

24 CONCLUSION

25 For the reasons set forth above, Dryg's petition for writ of habeas corpus is DENIED
26 because the state court's decision was neither contrary to, nor an unreasonable application
27 of, clearly established federal law; nor was it based on an unreasonable determination of
28 the facts in light of the evidence presented. This order fully adjudicates this case and

1 terminates all pending motions. The clerk shall close the file.

2 **IT IS SO ORDERED.**

3 Dated: April 13, 2009

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

28



PHYLLIS J. HAMILTON
United States District Judge